

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS PO. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
09/605,056	***************************************	06/28/2000	Kouhei Koyama	P107344-00003	P107344-00003 6772	
23353	7590	07/09/2003				
		& GRAUER PLI	EXAMINER			
	STREET	N.W., SUITE 501	COLAIANNI, MICHAEL			
WASHINGTON, DC 20036				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
				1731		

DATE MAILED: 07/09/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

,	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Advisory Action	09/605,056	KOYAMA ET AL.
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit
	Michael P Colaianni	1731
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address
THE REPLY FILED 23 June 2003 FAILS TO PLACE TH Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to average final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	oid abandonment of this applica a timely filed amendment whicl	ntion. A proper reply to a not places the application in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]	
a) The period for reply expires 6 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 C	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THOSE OF THE CONTRACT OF THE CONTR	g date of the final rejection. IE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP R 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension unt of the fee. The appropriate extension originally set in the final Office action; or
<ul> <li>1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on 23 June 2003. App. 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFF 2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be</li> </ul>	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal o	
		MOTELLA
(a) ⊠ they raise new issues that would require further	,	see NOTE below);
(b) ★ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	,	
<ul><li>(c)  they are not deemed to place the application ir issues for appeal; and/or</li></ul>		
(d) they present additional claims without cancell	ng a corresponding number of fi	nally rejected claims.
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .		
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ion(s):	
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a se	parate, timely filed amendment
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		dered but does NOT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	o issues which were newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we		
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		
Claim(s) allowed:		
Claim(s) objected to:		
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-14</u> .		
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a)☐ approved or b)☐ disapp	roved by the Examiner.
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemer	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	
10. Other:		I. I DARA
	MICHAEL COLAIANNI ///	webul & Colai-
	PRIMARY EXAMINER V	Michael`P Colaianni Primary Examiner Art Unit: 1731
The second secon		

Application No. 09/605,056

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The claims were amended to recite that the rotary drive unit was sized to "simultaneously" retain the the tape winding portion stationary in an axial direction. This limitation requires further consideration and search because previously the claims only required that the there be no axial movement of the winding portion and the rotary drive unit relative to one another. There was no requirement that the rotary drive unit be sized to achieve this desired result. Also, the language "simultaneously retain" and "stationary in an axial direction" must be examined for possible new matter. The arguments submitted with the response have been considered. However, because the amendment is not being entered, the claims remain rejected as set-forth in the Final Rejection. The comments made by the Examiner with respect to the finally rejected claims remain as set-forth in the Final Rejection.